



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Proceedings at New York, October 28th, 1880.

The autumn meeting was held in the Chapel of Columbia College, New York City, on Thursday, October 28th, 1880, commencing at 10 o'clock A. M.

The President, Vice-Presidents, and Recording Secretary being absent, Rev. W. Hayes Ward, D.D., of New York, was called to the chair, and Prof. C. H. Toy, D.D., of Cambridge, Mass., was appointed secretary *pro tempore*.

The Society accepted with thanks an invitation from Chanc. Howard Crosby, D.D., to meet socially in the evening at his house. A lunch was provided at noon by the liberality of persons connected with Columbia College, in the College refectory.

The Directors gave notice that they had designated Wednesday, May 25th, 1881, as the day of the next annual meeting, and the Recording Secretary and Dr. N. G. Clark, as Committee of Arrangements for it. They also recommended for Corporate Membership the following persons, who were thereupon duly elected by ballot:

Rev. Gustav Gottheil, of New York;
Rev. Adolphus Huebsch, of New York;
Mr. W. W. Rockhill, of Baltimore, Md.;
Rev. W. H. Sloan, of Albion, N. Y.

The Corresponding Secretary read extracts from the correspondence of the past half-year.

Rev. C. Bennett writes from Rangoon, in July, 1880, along with a donation to the Library of a number of missionary publications, in Burmese, Shan, and Karen:

"... There has not been much doing here for some time in the way of languages, but recently a professor of Pali has been attached to the Government High School, who is making researches in Pali as it exists in Burma. He has unearthed some old inscriptions on slabs that have been buried on the east side of Shway-da-gong Pagoda, but so recently that I am unable to report further upon them.

We have lately added to the Shan literature a "Manual" in Shan and English, by Rev. Mr. Cushing, and have in press, and nearly half completed, a Shan-English and English-Shan dictionary.

We have also in press a revised and enlarged edition of Dr. Judson's Burman and English Dictionary, but it has as yet only got into the second consonantal letter.

The Government is bringing out a valuable publication, in two quarto volumes. The one volume is a Gazetteer of British Burma, and the other an Introduction containing all accessible reliable information, historical and ethnological etc., on the country, including a good portion, if not all, of what was valuable in the work of Dr. Mason on Burma. The manuscript of his revised "Burmah" went into the hands of the Government soon after his death, and has remained there for years, although there was at one time talk of printing it." ...

Communications were then presented, as follows:

1. On the Alexandrian Obelisk, or so-called Cleopatra's Needle, in the New York Central Park, by Prof. G. Seyffarth, of New York.

Prof. Seyffarth referred briefly to the circumstances of gift and transfer of the obelisk, gave its dimensions, and proceeded to discuss its origin and antiquity. He pointed out that the popular opinion connecting it with Cleopatra has no foundation, as it was re-erected at Alexandria in the eighth year of the emperor Augustus, or B. C. 20, consequently after Cleopatra's death, and bears the names and titles of two kings who reigned earlier by eighteen and sixteen centuries; so that it was probably one of the works overthrown by Cambyses, B. C. 520. The two kings are Thuthmos III. and Ramses II. Prof. Seyffarth went on to discuss their age, and maintained that the former was the Pharaoh drowned in the Red Sea at the exodus of the Hebrews, which he believed to have taken place B. C. 1866; while Ramses the Great died B. C. 1664.

2. On the Worship of Ancestors in China, by Pres. W. A. P. Martin, of Peking, China.

A very brief abstract of Dr. Martin's paper is as follows:

Ritual observances occupy a large place in the Chinese scheme of government. Of these, none are cherished and inculcated with more care than those connected with the worship of ancestors. The Emperor sets an example of filial piety by associating his ancestors with Shangti, the Supreme God, in the sacrificial offerings which, as high priest of the empire, he makes at the temple of Heaven; tablets inscribed with their names being ranged on the right and left of that which bears the august name of the Ruler of the Universe.

Each family worships its own forefathers—twice a year at the cemetery, and twice a month at the family temple.

The influence of these rites has been no less beneficial than profound. They constitute a potent bond of social union; supply motives to deter from evil, and stimulate to good; and through ages past they have contributed to keep alive the popular faith in a future state.

This form of religion, though traceable in remote ages, derives its binding force largely from the authority of Confucius. As taught by him, it was free from two objectionable features: namely, the practice of invoking the spirits of ancestors as tutelary deities, and the superstitious belief that the location of their tombs has an effect on the destinies of their posterity.

Chinese of the upper classes, and indeed of all classes, are often deterred from embracing Christianity by being required to renounce the worship of their ancestors. Is it necessary to subject them to this ordeal? May they not be taught to abandon those superstitions which are excrescences on the ancient system, and yet retain the spirit and essence of an institution which might thus be rendered purely commemorative?

3. On the reading of the Syriac Versions of Luke xxiv. 32, by Prof. Isaac H. Hall, of Philadelphia.

Prof. Hall presented the results of his investigations upon this point (which he had communicated at greater length to an English society) in substance as follows:

The Curetonian Syriac is known to read *ܕܠܘܬ*, 'heavy,' instead of *ܕܠܘܬ*, 'burning,' in Luke xxiv. 32; and it seems to be thought by the critics to be supported only by the Thebaic, and perhaps by the Armenian. (See, for example, Scrivener's Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, ed. 1874; and ed. viii. of Tischendorf's Critica Major N. T., at the passage in question.)

The difference between the two readings depends solely upon a single point of the last letter. At the top it gives the first reading, at the bottom the second. No one conversant with Syriac MSS. will readily admit that the point has been misplaced by a copyist's mistake; it rather dates back to the time when the Syriac *doluth* and *rish* came first to be distinguished from each other by points;

when, most likely, the Syrians affixed the one which gave the meaning they had come already to apply to the unpointed letter.

The additional testimony I have found to this reading is the following:

A. *The Philoxenian or Harclean Syriac.* 1. The Codex I discovered in Beirût in 1876, nearer to the original Philoxenian than to the Harclean, reads **ܕܠܬܐ**, which is the same reading with only the prefix conjunction *dolath*. 2. White's edition (Oxford, 1778) of the Philoxenian, the only one yet printed, reads **ܕܠܬܐ**; which is the same reading as that of the Beirût codex, except that (perhaps by a printer's error) the second *yâd* is omitted. White indeed translates by '*ardens*;' but as he gives the Philoxenian margin *ܕܠܬܐ*—inexplicable if the original Syriac in the MS. or MSS. read so as to mean *ardens*—it is probable that White has made a mistake in translating, and given the right letter in the text. As it is, White's text has the verbal form instead of the participial.

B. *The Peshito.* 1. The above Philoxenian and Harclean readings are no slight testimony to the ancient Peshito reading. 2. The *editio princeps* of Widmanstad, 1555, reads **ܕܠܬܐ**. This was based on two Jacobite MSS., of alleged excellence. 3. The Four Gospels, printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1829, based on one Nestorian MS. brought from Mosûl by the missionary Wolff, has also the reading **ܕܠܬܐ**. 4. The American missionaries to the Nestorians found this to be the reading of the ancient MSS. there, and the one current among the Nestorian ecclesiastics. (See Dr. Justus Perkins' *Residence of Eight Years in Persia* [Andover, 1843], throughout, and particularly pp. 16, 17, where he specially mentions the fact, and the testing of one MS.). Dr. Perkins translated the Peshito New Testament into Modern Syriac, and in the translation gave the equivalent of this reading in the text, with that of the Greek in a foot-note. This was several times reprinted; but in the American Bible Society's *Mod. Syr. N. T.* of 1864, the text is changed to correspond with the Greek, for the reason that the Bible Soc. declined to print any more editions unless they were made to conform to the Greek. The American missionaries also issued the Peshito, the Old and New Testaments separate, in parallel columns with the Modern Syriac. This has always retained this reading; which, moreover, has never been thrust out by the American Bible Society; for it appears in their edition of the Ancient Syriac printed in New York in 1874. Under this head is also to be mentioned a Nestorian MS. deposited by Dr. Perkins at the A. B. C. F. M. rooms at Boston, and still there. It is of the 12th century, and has the same reading. 5. A Syriac Lectionary (presented at this meeting), which generally gives the church lessons after the Greek order, which was obtained by Dr. C. V. A. Van Dyck from the papal Jacobite Monastery in Damascus, has the same reading; only by accidentally omitting the second *yâd*, the word has the verbal instead of the participial form. The Lectionary is of the 12th or 13th century. 6. An ancient Jacobite MS. of the four Gospels in the library of the Union Theo. Sem. in New York, wrongly supposed by its custodians to be Nestorian, of the 10th to 12th century, has also the same reading. 7. An Evangelistarium in the library of the American Bible Society, written in splendid Estrangela, with here and there a note in Jacobite, said to be arranged after the Jacobite order, and probably of the 13th century, has also this reading.

There is thus a *primâ facie* case made out for the supposition that this is the true reading not only of the Curetonian, but also of the Philoxenian (or Harclean) and the Peshito. But the last word is to be said by the abundant MSS. in Europe.

4. Statistics of External Vowel-Combination in the Rig- and Atharva-Vedas, by Prof. W. D. Whitney and Mr. W. Haskell, of New Haven; presented by Prof. Whitney.

Prof. Whitney stated that, at the last meeting of the Society (see Proceedings for May, 1880: Journal, vol. xi., p. xxxii.), when discussing the laws of external *sandhi* of vowels in Sanskrit, he had drawn attention to the notable difference of usage in Vedic verse as regards, on the one hand, those combinations in which there is a coalescence of final and initial into a single vowel or diphthong, and, on the other hand, those in which an *i*- or *u*-vowel precedes a dissimilar vowel,

and, in order to the union of the two syllables into one, would have to be semi-vocalized, into *y* or *v* (*w*)—the former being usual, the latter only exceptional. He was not able, at the time referred to, to speak with the desirable degree of precision in respect to this usage, but had since taken pains, with the help of Dr. Haskell, to make such examination of the two leading Vedic texts as enabled him to supply at present what had then been left wanting. Dr. Edgren, namely, has set forth with sufficient fulness (Proceedings for October, 1878; Journal, vol. xi., p. 71) the Rig-Veda usage as to the combination of a final *i*- or *u*-vowel with a following initial in word-composition; the speaker had added the facts as to the treatment of coalescing vowels in the same situation; and he had further assembled the corresponding facts from the Atharvan text. Then, in order to bring in the other division of the external *sandhi*, that regarding the combination of separate words in the sentence, he had noted all the facts from a sufficient part of the Atharva-Veda: namely, the first four books and the tenth book (for certain particular combinations, from the whole text); and Dr. Haskell had done the same for books three and four of the Rig-Veda text, which, considering the general uniformity of the phenomena, was regarded as illustrating fully enough the Rig-Veda usage as to the points in question. The results are presented below, in tabular form.

First are given the combinations of *i* and *u* with a following dissimilar vowel in composition, the data for the Rig-Veda being taken (with some corrections and additions) from Dr. Edgren's article above referred to. As also in the next table, the numbers of separate stems and of their occurrences are given separately.

	Rig-Veda.				Atharva-Veda.			
	Combined.		Uncombined.		Combined.		Uncombined.	
	st.	occ.	st.	occ.	st.	occ.	st.	occ.
<i>i</i> + vowel,	9	16	51	173	21	29	44	103
<i>u</i> + vowel,	6	25	66	349	6	10	22	67
Total,	15	41	117	522	27	39	66	170

The compounds of *ac* or *añc* are excluded here, as in the statements below, although they might properly enough, at least in most cases, have been reckoned with the rest. The ratio of occurrences of combination of the two syllables into one is, it will be seen, for the Rig-Veda about 1 to 13 (7.3 per cent.); for the Atharva-Veda, about 1 to 4½ (18.7 per cent.). The difference between the two is evidently not fortuitous, but shows an increasing frequency of combination in the latter text; although the cases of it still constitute only a small minority.

Next follow the data for the treatment in composition of vowels that coalesce into a single vowel or diphthong:

	Rig-Veda.				Atharva-Veda.			
	Combined.		Uncombined.		Combined.		Uncombined.	
	st.	occ.	st.	occ.	st.	occ.	st.	occ.
<i>a</i> , <i>ā</i> and <i>a</i> , <i>ā</i>	115	312	19	79	123	645	11	13
“ “ <i>i</i> , <i>ī</i>	19	27	4	4	13	27		
“ “ <i>u</i> , <i>ū</i>	16	45	4	8	12	27	2	2
“ “ <i>r</i>	3	7			10	34	1	1
“ “ <i>e</i> , <i>āi</i>	2	3	2	2	6	9	1	1
“ “ <i>o</i> , <i>āu</i>	6	8	2	2	5	44		
<i>i</i> , <i>ī</i> “ <i>i</i> , <i>ī</i>	9	32			5	5		
<i>u</i> , <i>ū</i> “ <i>u</i> , <i>ū</i>	6	22	1	1	2	2	1	1
	176	456	32	96	176	793	16	18

Here, as is evident at a glance, the relation of the cases of combination to those of maintained independence of the vowels is directly reversed. The hiatus remains, in the Rig-Veda, in only about 1 case out of 6 (or in 17.4 per cent. of the occurrences); in the Atharva-Veda, in less than a fortieth of the cases (2.3 per cent.): the latter text, as before, showing a noticeable advance toward the usages of the later Sanskrit.

The data for the combinations of the sentence are presented below in a single comprehensive table, and with greater detail as regards the different vowels concerned. The numbers marked with an asterisk (*) include the cases occurring in the whole Atharvan text; the others, only those found in the passages defined above (RV. iii, iv.; AV. i.-iv., x.).

Coalescing vowels.	Rig-Veda.		Ath.-Veda.		Semivowel conversion	Rig-Veda.		Ath.-Veda.	
	com.	uncom.	com.	uncom.		com.	uncom.	com.	uncom.
<i>a</i> and <i>a</i>	84	22	204	23	<i>i</i> and <i>a</i>	2	107	40	63
“ “ <i>ā</i>	23	3	53	3	“ “ <i>ā</i>	0	29	6	29
“ “ <i>i</i>	54	5	99	8	“ “ <i>u</i>	1	16	3	15
“ “ <i>ī</i>	6		12		“ “ <i>ū</i>		1	2	
“ “ <i>u</i>	14	3	25	2	“ “ <i>ṛ</i>		3	2	6
“ “ <i>ū</i>	2	1	3	2	“ “ <i>e</i>		13	7	15
“ “ <i>ṛ</i>	10	1	23*	5*	“ “ <i>ai</i>		2		
“ “ <i>e</i>			40	1	“ “ <i>o</i>		6	2	9
“ “ <i>ai</i>	5	3	1		“ “ <i>au</i>			1	
“ “ <i>o</i>			8	2					
	—	—	—	—		3	177	63	137
<i>ā</i> and <i>a</i>	198	38	468	46	<i>ī</i> and <i>a</i>	0	8	4	11
“ “ <i>ā</i>	101	7	133	23	“ “ <i>u</i>	1	1		3
“ “ <i>i</i>	8	1	20	3	“ “ <i>ū</i>		1		
“ “ <i>ī</i>	77	2	70	3	“ “ <i>ṛ</i>		2		
“ “ <i>u</i>	2	0	3		“ “ <i>e</i>		1		4
“ “ <i>ū</i>	12	1	15	7		—	—	—	—
“ “ <i>ṛ</i>	2		1	1		1	13	4	18
“ “ <i>e</i>	5		6*	6*	<i>u</i> and <i>a</i>	0	45	10	66
“ “ <i>o</i>	2		20	4	“ “ <i>ā</i>		19		13
	—	—	—	—	“ “ <i>i</i>		5	2	1
<i>i</i> and <i>i</i>	209	12	268	47	“ “ <i>ī</i>	1			1
“ “ <i>ī</i>	9	2	58*	7*	“ “ <i>ṛ</i>		1		1
“ “ <i>u</i>	2	1	4*	2*	“ “ <i>e</i>		1	1	11
“ “ <i>ū</i>	7	3	23*	9*	“ “ <i>ai</i>			1	3
“ “ <i>ṛ</i>	1	0			“ “ <i>o</i>		2		11
“ “ <i>e</i>	0	2	1*	10*	“ “ <i>au</i>				1
“ “ <i>o</i>						—	—	—	—
	19	8	86	28		1	73	14	108
	—	—	—	—		5	263	81	263
Total	426	58	822	121					

It appears from this table that in all respects, with regard to the two classes of vowel-combination, the usage is closely parallel in sentence-collocation with the usage in composition. As between coalescing vowels, the combination is actually made in the Rig-Veda in more than seven-eighths (88 per cent.) of the instances; in the Atharva-Veda, in almost precisely the same proportion (87 per cent.). But in cases involving conversion to a semivowel, the combination is made in the Rig-Veda only in one-fiftieth of the instances (2 per cent.); in the Atharva-Veda, in less than a quarter (24 per cent.). And here, as in the cases treated above, the usage of the Atharvan, as compared with that of the Rik, makes a perceptible advance, though by no means a near approach, toward that of the later language.

5. On Certain Points connected with Chaldean Seals, by Rev. W. Hayes Ward, of New York.

In his paper, *Empreintes de Cylindres Assyro-Chaldéens*, M. Ménant has stated his objections to regarding the temptation of the first pair as represented on an ancient cylinder, on which are figured, apparently, a man and a woman sitting one on each side of a tree, plucking its fruit, while behind the woman is an erect serpent. George Smith (Chaldean Genesis, p. 91), gives this interpretation, and is followed by Delitzsch and Baudissin. But Ménant says that the two personages “are two men, such as are found on numerous analogous cylinders;” that “the

tree has nothing in common with the tree of the terrestrial paradise;" and, finally, that "the serpent appears in this scene only as in a large number of others, where his presence is as yet unexplained." It were to be desired that M. Ménant had referred us to the "numerous analogous seals" which he speaks of. The appearance of the serpent is quite rare on the seals. In 111 seals and cylinders published by Ménant, there is not another representation of the serpent. Among 30 or 40 figured by Layard, not one contains a serpent. In Lajard's *Culte de Mithra*, the best collection published, out of about 200 there is only one other that contains a serpent, and that is the chief figure of the cylinder, having a human head and six folds. In Cullimore's Oriental Cylinders, 4 out of 169 seem to contain a serpent, probably Cabiric. Besides, there is Dr. S. Wells Williams's cylinder, on which a serpent takes the place of the usual griffin pursued by Merodach. The serpent does not seem to have been a common emblem. As to the tree having "nothing in common with the tree of the terrestrial paradise," it is not clear how M. Ménant knows this. No monumental testimony explains the worship of the tree, and there is evidence that it was called the "tree of life." That there should have been a legend of the Fall corresponding to that in Genesis, is in itself probable. As to the two figures being both masculine, there is no evidence offered, and the statement lacks probability. One of the figures is plainly masculine, although the usual beard is not given in the representations published. But the arrangement of the hair on the back of the head, and the horns, fix it as masculine. The other figure is without beard or horns, and there are no masculine signs. Ménant says (*Empreintes*, p. 46) that, in the frequently recurring group on the cylinders, where a bearded god sits on a throne and a beardless personage in a flounced dress and a peaked cap, and with a waving horizontal lock of hair behind, leads by the hand another beardless figure, as if presenting it to the god, the two beardless figures are also both masculine. But this flounced figure, which occurs scores of times, is never bearded, and must be feminine. Ménant says there are cylinders in which the "neophyte" led in is bearded. This is true, and there are also cases where it has the head of a bird, probably the wicked *Zu* bird; and it disproves the notion that this is the virgin brought every night to the bed of Belus; but a better explanation is that there is figured a scene in Hades, and that souls of the dead, male or female, are being brought for judgment to the god Hea. The streams occasionally flowing from the sitting figure show it to be Hea. Figure 18 of Cullimore's Oriental Cylinders, in which two figures, unquestionably male and female, sit one on each side of a table, is convincing evidence that a male and a female figure may be put *vis-à-vis*: compare, also, the famous cylinder of Dungi, where a bearded and a beardless figure stand one on each side of a similar tree with hanging fruit, best figured in Tompkins's *Times of Abraham*, Pl. III., H. The only evidence against the cylinder under consideration representing a legend of the temptation is found in Ménant's Catalogue of the Cylinders in the Museum of the Hague, fig. 14, where is seen a very similar tree with depending fruit, and a standing feminine figure on each side plucking it, while one hands it to a third female figure. There is here, however, no serpent.

Another question is raised by the notched or saw-like sword, always carried in the right hand by one of the gods, who appears regularly with profile face to the left, and with the right foot raised and resting on a square support, as in Cullimore, figs. 29, 44, 45, etc. This is probably the same god as the seated winged figure, Lajard, l. i., and again, standing between two cones, in Smith's Chaldean Genesis, p. 159. I would suggest that this notched weapon was of wood with flint teeth set in the edge, as in the case of the Mexican weapon called *maguahuilitl*: see Stephen's Yucatan, i. 413. It is noticeable that two of the hieroglyphics in the Hittite inscriptions, Nos. 10 and 44 of my catalogue, are weapons of a very similar sort. I do not, however, know other evidence that weapons armed with flints were ever in use in the Old world.

Mr. Smith, in his Chaldean Genesis, pp. 158-9, gives figures of three cylinders which may, he thinks, represent the building of a tower, perhaps of Babel: see other figures, Lajard, xviii. 3, 4; xl. 8; xlii. 13; Cullimore, fig. 165; and Ménant's Catalogue of the Hague, 15, 16. These can hardly be towers. When most perfect, they seem to have projections on one side at the top and bottom on which to swing. The ornamental lines on top of them in one cylinder hardly agree with

towers. Can they be a portable sacred column, to be carried about and stuck in the ground where wanted? In one case this "tower" is adorned with two wings like those of the divine circle, and has a stream flowing from near its top into the lap of a woman on one side, and on the other to the ground, where a man puts his hands into it. The wings can hardly belong to a gate or a tower. They represent a special divine influence, as does, probably, the stream. In a cylinder in Smith's Chaldean Genesis, p. 106, of much later date, two streams descend from a divine winged circle, which the Assyrian king is holding, as if to receive the divine influence.

6. A Greek Inscription from over a city-gate in Beirût, by Prof. Isaac H. Hall.

Though the city of Beirût has long outgrown its old walls, yet much of the wall and several of the gates still remain. One of these, a minor one, stands over an alley—a very respectable ancient street, however—which leads off into the old city from the wide street running from near the American press down to the Place du Canon. The level of the alley is now some seven or eight feet below that of the wide street, and the width of the gateway is six or seven feet. Over the gateway is an arch; but under the arch, and forming a supplementary lintel, are two long stones, one above the other, each bearing two lines of an inscription. The lines are about eight feet long and the letters about three and a half inches high. The stones and the inscription are much older than the wall or the gateway, and were apparently built in for their preservation. The letters are not deeply cut, but are quite legible. Their shape gives no certain clue to their date. The letters *sigma* and *epsilon* have the rounded forms of the uncial manuscripts; the *lambda* nearly that of the cursive character, though it does not project above the line; the *theta* is a circle with a dot in the middle; and the *omega* is like those of the uncial manuscripts, but turned upside down. There is no division between the words.

Shortly before I left Beirût I went down to copy the inscription, in the blazing noonday; but having no ladder, the nearest approach to copying on a level was to stand on the supporting wall of the wide street above, some twenty feet off. Then I could descend and come nearer; but, in any way I could manage it, the inscription was several feet away. I suspect, therefore, that I have made a mistake or two in the copy, which will be noticed presently. The following is the copy as I made it:

- (1.) THCTOTYΠPOCIONTOCANΔPOCENNOIACAEI
- (2.) CAΦE Cε λE ΓXOCHYΠPOCΘYIE ΓE INE KAI
- (3.) ΔIΔOYHΠPOΘYM TCOΠAPEXE ICHMHΔIΔOY
- (4.) ΠAPATAPTOME IKPONTE INE TAIHΠZHPHCXAPIC

On studying the inscription carefully, it seems all right except the second line. The lines are four verses of iambic trimeter, but neither sense nor meter is apparent in the second line as it now reads. The natural emendations to be thought of are an *η* for the first *ε* (though as inscriptions are cut and manuscripts are written, the two letters sometimes change places); a *ς* in place of the *ε* after *σφ*, as the difference consists only in the middle stroke, for which I have doubtless mistaken a scratch; and a *τ* for the *κ*. These emendations had suggested themselves some time ago; but to get a better opinion, I submitted the copy to Dr. Drisler, of Columbia College, who independently suggested the same. Meanwhile I have written to Beirût for a new examination of those points. The probability is that I have made the mistakes; but I have found heretofore that stone-cutters and scribes do sometimes make mistakes of their own.

Adopting these emendations, the inscription becomes, written in modern shape:

Τῆς τοῦ προσιώντος ἀνδρὸς ἐννοίας ἀεὶ
σαφὲς ἔλεγχος ἡ πρόσσψις γίνεταί·
δίδον προθύμως δὲ παρέχεις ἢ μὴ δίδον·
παρὰ γὰρ τὸ μεικρὸν γίνεταί πλήρης χάρις.

Of the disposition of the approaching man ever the sight becomes a clear proof:

give readily what thou hast by thee, or give not; for with the little comes full favor.'

Whether these lines are taken from one of the (comic) poets or not, I do not know; but if so, this stone copy is probably as ancient authority as any extant manuscript. I suspect that they formerly occupied a place in connection with some Greek ecclesiastical building. One cannot help thinking, however, of the famous law-schools and other semi-gospel institutions of Berytus, among which the *Xenodocheia* were very prominent. The student of the Pandects can raise many conjectures. At present the inscription is directly across the way from the institution of the French Sisters of Charity.

7. On the *Ikhwan as-Safa* or 'Pure Brothers,' by Rev. A. Huebsch, of New York.

The following is a brief summary of Dr. Huebsch's paper:

The association of Arabian philosophers bearing this name flourished in the 10th century. A monument of their activity is the encyclopædic work which is styled "Treatises of the Pure Brothers." This cyclopedia consists of fifty-two treatises, comprising all branches of knowledge. Corresponding to the four degrees of the order, knowledge was divided into four divisions: 1. the mathematico-philosophical division; 2. physical science; 3. psychology; 4. the divine law. The subjects of the treatises are: i. On numbers; ii. Geometry; iii. Astronomy; iv. Geography; v. Music; vi. Arithmetic and geometric relations; vii. Arts of knowledge; viii. Arts of practice; ix. Ethics; x. Introduction to philosophy; xi. The ten categories; xii. Hermeneutics; xiii. Apodictics; xiv. On matter and form, space and time; xv. Heaven and earth; xvi. Composition and decomposition; xvii. Celestial phenomena; xviii. Minerals; xix. Essence of nature; xx. Plants; xxi. Animals; xxii. Organization of the human body; xxiii. Sense and sensible things; xxiv. Embryonic development; xxv. Man a mikrokosmos; xxvi. Development of the individual soul in human bodies; xxvii. Limits of human knowledge; xxviii. Proper significance of life and death; xxix. On bodily and spiritual pleasure and pain; xxx. On the variety of languages; xxxi. The principles of reason according to Pythagoras; xxxii. The principles of reason according to the views of the Pure Brothers; xxxiii. The world a makrokosmos; xxxiv. The understanding and its object; xxxv. Revolutions of the stars and spheres; xxxvi. The soul's love; xxxvii. The resurrection and future life; xxxviii. Quantity and variety of motion; xxxix. Cause and effects; xl. Definitions and determinations; xli. Difference of view on principles of creed; xlii. The right path to God; xliii. Creed of the Pure Brothers; xliv. Life of the Pure Brothers; xlv. True contents of the Mohammedan creed; xlvi. Essence of the divine *nomos*; xlvii. The call to God; xlviii. Spirits and their actions; xlix. Forms of government; l. The order and succession of beings constitutes the existence of the world; li. On witchcraft; lii. A descriptive index of the preceding treatises.

To Prof. F. Dieterici, the principal authority on the *Ikhwan as-Safa* and their writings, we are indebted for accurate information on this subject, furnished in his excellent book, *Die Philosophie der Araber im Xten Jahrhundert nach Chr.*

Though the volumes of the Pure Brothers are pervaded by a deeply religious spirit, the principle confessed by the authors, that the Mohammedan religion had become adulterated and that the only way to purify it was to bring it into close alliance with Greek philosophy, was sufficient to stamp the members of this order with the stigma of heresy in the eyes of every orthodox Mohammedan. Thus it came that little mention was made of the fraternity by Arabian writers; and as no author signed his name to the volume he composed, we should be in utter ignorance to whom the authorship of this little but very significant library belonged, if Shahrzuri had not been less scrupulous than the other pious chroniclers; he mentions five men as the authors of the fifty-one treatises, and Haji Khalfa gives the following names: 1. Abu Suleiman Muhammed ibn Nasr al Busti, surnamed al mukaddisi; 2. Abu-l-Hasan Ali ibn Harun az Zanjani; 3. Abu Ahmed an Naharzuri; 4. Al 'Afi; 5. Zaid ibn Rifa'a.

The paper concluded with a translation of the parable on how the Pure Brothers should live.

8. On a Manuscript Syriac Lectionary, by Prof. Hall.

This manuscript was obtained by Dr. C. V. A. Van Dyck, of Beirût, from the papal Jacobite convent in Damascus. For a Syriac MS. its contents are uncommon. They consist of a Lectionary in the Syriac language, but arranged after the Greek order. The Lectionary consists of an Evangelistarium, or Gospel lessons for the ecclesiastical year, and a Menology, or calendar of saints' days or feasts for every day in the civil year. The beginning of the Evangelistarium is gone; but the beginning of the Menology expressly states that it is "after the Greek order."

Externally, the manuscript appears to be in the original binding: heavy wooden boards covered with leather. The traces of metallic ornaments appear on both sides, and the two stout brass pins which caught the clasps are still there.

The MS. now contains 95 leaves of ancient, tough cotton paper (*charta Damascena*), glazed after the fashion of the better oriental paper MSS., and somewhat worm-eaten and worn, especially at the two ends. It originally consisted of 13 quires of 4 folios or 8 leaves each, except two, which had 5 folios or 10 leaves each. Besides the regular numbering of the quires or signatures, some later hand has added the same in Arabic—in words, not figures. This latter writing, however, is older than the current script of to-day. Originally there were 108 leaves, of which 13 are now missing. In nearly every case where a leaf is gone, a slight stump is left, besides the other plain evidences. The worm holes present no obstacle to the reading; the only difficult places are those where water has damaged the upper half of the first twenty leaves, with a few smaller spots elsewhere. In a few places, not half a dozen lines in all, a second hand has retraced the reading where it had been destroyed by water, along with the glazing.

The writing is in two columns to the page, 34 lines to the column. At the end of each principal division of the subject matter is usually an ornament, occupying the space of from one to four lines. Otherwise there is scarcely a break. In one, or perhaps two places, a space left for a rubric has remained unfilled; and here and there a blank is left at the end of a line where the end of the paragraph does not quite fill it. The height of the columns is 7 to 7½ inches, the width of the inner column 2½ inches, of the outer 2¼. The space between the columns is ⅔ of an inch.

The style of writing is a mixture of the Estrangela with the Jacobite; the latter more of the Palestinian than of the Mesopotamian type. Ornamental initials conform generally to the old Estrangela, except in case of *olaph*, which occurs in the greatest variety of shapes, but never in the marked Nestorian form. It is easy, on the whole, for one acquainted with the Estrangela to read the character, but not for one who is familiar only with the common printed varieties.

There may have been two scribes. The handwriting is bolder in the later portions of the MS., and a few constant errors and misspellings in the first portions disappear in the later.

In both the Evangelistarium and the Menology there appears here and there an auxiliary lesson note in Arabic; but these are only fourteen in all. They are written in the older Neskhî, but not as early as the transition from Cufic. Some of them appear to note lessons after the Syrian order. In one place mention is directly made of the coincidence with the Syrian lesson for a saint's day. Thus the contents of the MS., together with the actual mention of "the Greek order," fix the limit of its antiquity in the 12th century, and at the same time forbid assigning it to a much later date. With this the style of writing agrees; except that it seems to shut out the 12th century, and confine us to the 13th. It is not probable, though it is barely possible, that it was written early in the 14th. The early half of the 13th is the more probable date.

In the rendering of ecclesiastical terms, personal epithets, and the like, the genius of the MS. inclines to the Syriac rather than to the Greek; though here and there a Greek genitive seems to be transferred. Such words as Chrysostom, Theologus, Stylites, Theotokos are translated into their Syriac equivalents. The transliteration of foreign words, including proper names, with all the other minutiae which give a clue to the linguistic genius of the MS., show that the writers were pretty thoroughly Syrian, familiar with Arabic, but not well acquainted with Greek. The codex is, so to speak, at the opposite pole from the Syriac and Armenian palimpsest described by Tischendorf in his *Anecdota Sæc. et Prof.*, p. 13.

The Evangelistarium agrees very nearly with the Greek lessons as given in Scrivener's *Plain Introduction*, pp. 68-79, and in Smith's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, pp. 955 ff., except that it commonly gives only the lessons for Saturdays and Sundays, with the more important fast and feast days. Week-day lessons are given from Easter to Pentecost, in Holy Week, and a few other places. The Menology gives the saints' day lessons for every day in the year, and agrees as often as it disagrees with that given in Scrivener's *Plain Introduction*, pp. 81 ff., and his extracts from the Jerusalem Syriac on pp. 291, 292. Several saints' names occur which I have not found elsewhere.

The scribe has here and there committed an error in writing the name of one Evangelist in place of another, and in writing the abbreviation for "pentecost" where he intended "passover," and the like. He has been (apparently) too free in his use of the diacritic marks which denote the plural. Otherwise diacritic points are rare, and generally confined to those which denote whether a pronoun is used substantively or in place of the substantive verb, and the like.

I have collated the scripture readings with the text of Leusden and Schaaf (ed. of 1708; I have not the 2d, better one), as the most convenient standard; though I think the American Bible Society's edition has a far better text. The version is Peshito, of course. Of the collation no remarks are needed here. It may be stated that the last 12 verses of the Gospel of Mark occur as the third of the eleven "Resurrection Gospels," as might be expected. The *pericope de adultera*, as also to be expected, is ignored in the lesson which covers the context. In the lesson notes occur the notes of the Psalm, or of the Stichera (called *Stichéron* in the MS.); and these generally follow the text of the American edition, and Dathe's Erpenius, and not that of the English edition. One Psalm appears to come from a place outside the Bible. (It is well known that the Psalms, etc., in the Maronite ritual include some from Ephrem, Jacob or James, and other fathers.) In Ps. xlv. 17, several times cited in the MS., the word for 'thy name' has a feminine suffix pronoun, as better fits the context; though the Masoretic Hebrew and the English edition of the Peshito have it masculine.

The church lessons themselves, after the rubrics, most commonly begin with an introductory phrase, such as "At that time," "Our Lord said to the Jews," or "Our Lord said to his disciples." Sometimes they transpose the opening words, or add a word or more to the lesson from the context to make the meaning clear. Thus, "Jesus said," or "Jesus came," for "he said" or "he came." Cases where the *ipsissima verba* of the Gospel begin the lesson are the infrequent exception.

The rubricated portions of the notes are mingled with black, apparently with no other rule than to aid the eye. Abbreviations are very common in the notes, but not in the text, and then they are of the most obvious sort.

As the manuscript now is, it commences in the midst of the lesson for Tuesday after Easter, at Luke xxiv. 18. Gaps in the MS. have taken away also the last four verses from the next Saturday's lesson, all of the next Sunday's, and matter from the lessons of the eve of Good Friday, occupying two leaves. The Evangelistarium is therefore nearly complete; and the missing portions could probably be supplied with certainty. (The paper presented contains a translation of the lesson notes, and gives the scripture places of the lessons.) The lessons for the week days of Lent are quite different from those of the ordinary Greek order.

The Menology commences with Ilûl, or September, and goes through the year. With each month, at the commencement, is stated the number of days, and the number of day-time hours and of night-time hours—with one or two exceptions. The translation of the rubrics of the Menology (given in full in the paper presented) presented many difficulties in the transliteration of proper names. Two words occur for the 'commemoration' of a saint or an event; two words for 'saint,' and two for 'Gospel.' The first two cases present difficulty in close rendering; the last case none at all, as 'Evangel' and 'Gospel' fit the case perfectly. Two expressions occur for 'mother of God,' one literal, the other the Syriac equivalent for *θεοτοκος* or *Deipara*. The word for 'apostle' is used with a very great latitude, and yet means less than 'missionary.'

In the Menology the gaps, though less in quantity of missing leaves, are harder to fill than those of the Evangelistarium. They are the following: Ilûl (Sept.) 17

to the latter portion of the 1st of Tishrîn 2 (Oct.); the latter portion of 18th day of Canûn 1 (December) to latter portion of 3d day of Canûn 2 (January); 21st day of Hezîran (June) by error of scribe; latter part of 29th Ab (August) to the end. Lessons, or parts of lessons, are thus wanting for 36 days of the Menology, or about one-tenth of the whole. The lessons are not always written out in full in the Menology, but denoted by reference. The following sample of one of the longer rubrics, taken at random, from the 4th of Canûn 1, or December, shows one style. The passages merely referred to are denoted in brackets; the one unbracketed is written out in full.

"4. Commemoration of Saints Barbara and Juline [or Juliane], and of the pious John of Damascus. Psalm before the Gospel of matins: My soul keepeth thy testimonies and loveth them wondrously [Ps. cxix. 167]. Section: Princes have persecuted me without a cause [Ps. cxix. 161]. Gospel of Matins from Matthew. Saturday 17 from Matthew [Matt. xxv. 1-13]. And in the priestly ministration, from Mark. Mark v. 24-28."

A good many choice bits of history or fable come out, which I have not always found elsewhere. In the note for the 9th of Tammûz (July) occurs the following remark, which has a classic as well as an ecclesiastical hinge: "And in this day appeared the mother of God at the trembling water in the mount of Daphne. For she appeared to the apostles and [to] John, when they wandered by the Holy Spirit from Sion mother of the church and established there the first born of Antioch the city of Syria, having obtained mercy with God."

The Scripture passages now in the MS., not counting the short ones inserted for reference, are the following:

Matthew i. 1-25; iii. 13-17; iv. 1-25; v. 1-48; vi. 1-33; vii. 1-11, 24-29; viii. 1-34; ix. 1-13, 18-35; x. 1-8, 16-22, 32, 33, 37-42; xi. 1-15, 27-30; xii. 30-37; xiii. 45-54; xiv. 1-12, 14-34; xv. 21-39; xvi. 13-20; xvii. 1-27; xviii. 1-4, 10-20, 23-35; xix. 3-12, 16-30; xx. 1-16, 29-34; xxi. 1-11, 15-43; xxii. 1-46; xxiii. 1-39; xxiv. 1-51; xxv. 1-46; xxvi. 1, 2, 6-16, 44-75; xxvii. 1-66; xxviii. 1-15.

Mark i. 9-11, 35-44; ii. 1-12, 14-17, 23-45; iii. 1-5; v. 24-28; vi. 14-27; vii. 31-37; viii. 27-31, 34-38; ix. 1, 17-31; x. 32-45; xi. 1-11, 22-26; xv. 16-41, 43-47; xvi. 1-20.

Luke i. 1-68, 76-80; ii. 22-40; iii. 1-22; iv. 1-13, 16-41; v. 1-11, 17-32; vi. 1-10, 17-23, 31-36; vii. 1-23, 36-48; viii. 5-21, 26-39, 41-56; ix. 1-6, 28-43, 57-62; x. 1-12, 16-21, 25-42; xi. 27, 28; xii. 2-12, 16-21, 32-40; xiii. 10-17, 19-29; xiv. 1-11, 16-24; xv. 2-32; xvi. 10-31; xvii. 3-10, 12-19; xviii. 9-14, 18-27, 35-43; xix. 1-10, 28-40; xx. 1-8, 46, 47; xxi. 1-4, 8, 9, 25-27, 33-36; xxii. 1-39; xxiii. 32-49; xxiv. 1-12, 18-53.

John i. 29-51; iii. 1-28; iv. 46-54; v. 1-15, 17-47; vi. 1, 2, 5-33, 35-44, 47-59; vii. 1-30, 37-52; viii. 12-59; ix. 1-41; x. 1-9, 17-42; xi. 1-45, 47-54; xii. 1-50; xiii. 1-8, 31-38; xiv. 1-31; xv. 1-27; xvi. 1-33; xvii. 1-26; xviii. 1-40; xix. 1-42; xx. 1-18; xxi. 1-25.

These are enumerated simply as being present in the MS. The table of lessons would be very different. Besides this, a number of passages from all the Evangelists occur twice, some from Matthew and John three times, and some from John four times. The portions relating to the passion are those which are most repeated.

9. On the connection between verbs of 'putting' and 'giving,' by Prof. Charles Short, of Columbia College, New York.

Prof. Short illustrated the near relation between the verbs signifying 'put' and 'give' principally from the Indo-European roots *dhā* and *dā*, and their confusions and interchanges of office even in Sanskrit, but still more in the other branches of Indo-European language, especially the Latin. He regarded it as probable that these two roots were twin forms of one original. Corresponding facts from the Semitic and other tongues were adduced.

10. On the Chinese accounts of Fu-sang, supposed by some to designate America, and of other countries described in connection with this, by Prof. S. Wells Williams, of New Haven.

Prof. Williams's paper presented the account given by the Chinese archæologist Ma Twan-lin respecting Fu-sang and certain other countries lying east of China beyond sea. This eminent author flourished in the troubled times which witnessed the conquest of his native land by the Mongols under Kublai Khan; and he was busy writing his Antiquarian Researches while Marco Polo was travelling about the country (A. D. 1275 to 1295) in the service of the Grand Khan. The date of the deaths of these two men was about the year 1324. Ma Twan-lin's work is arranged in twenty-five books, the last one named Researches into the Four Frontiers; out of its 250 sections, only nine describe the maritime countries on the east. The account of Japan is too long to translate here, and would add nothing to clear up the question as to the identification of Fu-sang. The other eight are translated from the original text, in the order in which they stand, since this order has a bearing upon the position of Fu-sang. They are the following:

Sect. XVI.—*Hia-i*. The land of the Crab Barbarians or Foreigners.

Sect. XVII.—*Fu-sang*. The kingdom of Fu-sang.

Sect. XVIII.—*Nü Kwoh*. The kingdom of Women.

Sect. XIX.—*Wän Shün*. The kingdom of Pictured Bodies.

Sect. XX.—*Ta Han*. The kingdom of Great Han.

Sect. XXI.—*Chü Jü Kwoh*. The kingdom of Dwarfs.

Sect. XXII.—*Chang-jin Kwoh*. The kingdom of Giants.

Sect. XXIII.—*Liu-kiu*. The kingdom of Lewchew.

The first of the eight is known to refer to the island of Yezo, and the Chinese still call the region by that name. The next country, Fu-sang, is not described by Ma Twan-lin himself; he merely quotes the narrative of the Shaman or Buddhist priest Hwui-shin, who returned from Fu-sang in A. D. 499. This man reported that it lay twenty thousand *li* (about 7000 miles) east of China, and was famous for its *fu-sang* trees, whence it derived its name. The people made paper from the bark of this tree, and also spun thread of which they manufactured cloth and brocade for dresses. They knew how to write, and had an established government. Hwui-shin's account contains several other particulars, which were first made use of by the learned orientalist De Guignes in 1761 to prove that the land thus described was Mexico. This view has been criticised by Klaproth, supported by Neumann, and in China made the subject of papers by Bretschneider and Sampson, who opposed the view of De Guignes. All their arguments were reviewed by Leland in a small volume published in 1875, in which he upheld the original opinion of De Guignes. His conclusion has since found an advocate in the French sinologue Marquis d'Hervey de St. Denis, who had met with some additional information in a Chinese history. Prof. Williams summarized the arguments which make it difficult to regard Mexico as the country spoken of, and mentioned two especially, which are derived from Hwui-shin's report itself. One is the manufacture of *kin* or brocade from the bark of the *fu-sang* tree (*Broussonetia papyrifera*); this fabric, called *nishiki*, is woven of silk and paper, and still worn by the Japanese. He exhibited a specimen of this peculiar cloth which was obtained in 1854 at Hakodaté in Yezo; its iridescence is very remarkable; and no such fabric is known to have ever been woven in any other land. The other proof against Fu-sang being Mexico is the statement that the colors of the king's robes varied with the ten cyclic years which denote the dual action of the five elements, wood, fire, earth, metal, water. This reference shows that at the time the people of Fu-sang knew and adopted the sexagenary cycle for computing time and periods; while no such scheme is known to have existed among any people on the American continent. The probability was strong, therefore, that Fu-sang referred to the island of Saghalien, a part of which once belonged to Japan under the name of Karafto; this conclusion is supported by the old name *Fu-shi koku*, or kingdom of Fu-sang, which the Japanese employ for their own kingdom even to this day.

The 18th in the list is the kingdom of Women, a country only reported on the authority of the same priest Hwui-shin. It seems to refer to one of the Kurile Islands; and a legend of the same nature is alluded to by Col. Yule, in his *Cathay and the Way Thither*, as current in Ma Twan-lin's time.

The notice of the 19th, called the land of Pictured Bodies, is not directly ascribed to Hwui-shin, but to the histories of the same period; it cannot be

decided whether tattooing, or marking the body with colored clay like the North American Indians, is meant. This land would naturally be looked for also among the Kurile Islands, as it is placed 2000 miles northeast of Japan.

The 20th in the list is mentioned by several Chinese authors, and their various accounts of Ta Han only prove that they had no definite idea of its position.

In the next section three separate kingdoms are mentioned: namely, the land of Dwarfs, the Black Teeth kingdom, and the Naked People's Land. The notices are all probably hearsay reports of places in the Indian Archipelago.

The 22d section speaks of a land of Giants, and from the reference in it to *Sin-lo*, or Eastern Corea, one would look for it in the islands between that country and Japan. A small Japanese cyclopedia was shown to the Society, in which a naked giant was represented as holding a richly dressed dwarf standing on his extended palm.

The last of these eastern kingdoms described is Lewchew, but the description confuses the Pescadore and Madji-co-sima groups with their more easterly and civilized kingdom.

The conclusion to be derived from all these various notices of the lands situated east of China is, that Ma Twan-lin had no definite knowledge of any of them from personal observation, and gathered his accounts from the most credible sources at his command, supposing that they were all easily reached by Chinese and Japanese vessels.

11. On Indra in the Rig-Veda, by Mr. E. D. Perry, of Columbia College, New York City.

The primary object of this essay is to give as distinct an account of the god Indra as possible, as he appears in the light shed upon him by the hymns of the Rig-Veda; more especially, to determine with accuracy the position held by him in the Vedic pantheon, and his original significance. his *Naturbedeutung*: i. e. the powers of Nature which lie behind and are symbolized by this striking personification. The preliminary part of the work is of course a searching examination of the hymns themselves, and a conscientious interpretation of all passages in any way bearing upon the subject. Great care is taken to avoid two dangers: on the one hand, that of overhasty combination and comparison with seeming parallels in extra-Indian mythology; and on the other, that of following too closely what may be called the ritualistic tendency, which puts these ancient hymns (which breathe out the freshness of nature, and display the Indian people in the vigor of youth) on the same level with the religious monstrosities of a cunning, subtle ingenious, and yet frivolous priesthood of a later age, and attempts to explain obscure points in the text by not less imperfectly understood details of the later ceremonial.*

The Rig-Veda is the only source from which materials have been thus far drawn. The Brâhmanas show so decided an advance beyond Vedic ideas that great confusion would have followed any attempt to combine them. The same reason prevails with regard to the Yajus. The Sâman contains only 60 or 70 verses not found in the Rik, and these offer nothing of value. A preliminary examination of the Atharvan shows that the results to be obtained from it would not differ materially from those furnished by the Rik, and its discussion has been postponed until later.

The essay is divided into four parts, as follows: I. The primitive conceptions of the Indians regarding Indra, and the powers of nature which are represented under this personification; II. The accounts of Indra's parentage, and the narratives and legends of his birth; III. The functions of Indra in the supernatural and the natural, the physical and the moral world; IV. The conception of Indra as a definite person, and the descriptions of him resulting from this conception.

I. The opinion has prevailed among scholars that Indra was, both in his origin and subsequent development, a sky-god. Roth, in his first published essay on

* To the first of these perils Myriantheus seems to have fallen a prey; his work, *Die Ävins oder Arischen Dioskuren*, was published at Munich in 1876. The other has often proved disastrous to Alfred Hillebrandt, who is represented in this field by two books, *Ueber die Göttin Aditi* (Breslau, 1876), and *Varuna und Mitra* (1877).

the subject of Indian religion (in Zeller's Theol. Jahrbuch, 1846) calls him the god of the bright clear vault of heaven;* Lassen, in his *Indische Alterthumskunde*, takes substantially the same view, differing from Roth only in regard to the etymology of the name. Wuttke failed completely to grasp the true nature of Indra, and saw him only from the standpoint of the later Brahmanic descriptions. Benfey, Müller, Grassmann, and others call him a sky-god (Grassmann, the god of the bright firmament; the others, the god of the rain-sky).† Ludwig cautiously names him "the god of the sky, under whose protection and guidance stand on the one hand the sun and stars, on the other the phenomena of the thunder-storm;" and adds that this deity seems to unite in his one person the characteristics of several older divinities. Bergaigne, viewing only the ethical side of Indra's nature, maintains that he is less intimately connected with natural phenomena than any other of the Indian divinities. It is here attempted to be proved that for the Vedic period at least Indra is to be regarded, not as a sky-god, but as belonging to a region the conception of which was purely and exclusively Indian—the region of the air, a middle ground between heaven and earth; and that he was above all the personification of the thunder-storm, of the storm in its entire magnificence and grandeur; in which respect he is distinguished from the other storm gods, who represent particular features of that phenomenon.

The most probable derivation of the word *indra* is that proposed by Roth: namely, from the root *in* or *inv*, from which the word is formed with the suffix *ra*, a *d* being inserted, as in Greek *ἄν-δ-ρός, μέσην-β-ρία*. Ludwig mentions a Slavonic word, *jedrŭ*, 'swift,' as the only representative of *indra* in Indo-European language.

II. The passages in which reference is made to the circumstances of Indra's birth are numerous, much less so those which afford any clue to the subject of his parentage. They are best divided into four groups: viz. 1. physical accounts, i. e. such as display most prominently the original element of the mythus, the immediate impression made by the observation of natural phenomena, in which details that mightiest of phenomena, the thunder-storm, are described, often with striking fidelity; 2. anthropomorphic accounts, in which Indra's original significance in nature gives place to his humanized form and character, and in which, accordingly, his birth is represented as occurring in accordance with human experience; 3. accounts which mention Indra's parentage, but omit to name or characterize sufficiently his parents; and 4. accounts of his origin which are plainly the results of conscious speculation on the part of the priests. Dyaus or heaven seems to have been thought of as Indra's father, whenever any one particular deity is meant, and as his mother, Prithivī or earth. Later views made him a child of Aditi; but the opinion, advanced by Hillebrandt, that this is to be accepted for the Vedic period too, is quite untenable. In several passages Indra is called *putrah çavasas*, 'Son of Might;' accordingly, the name Çavasi, applied to his mother in two passages, seems merely equivalent to 'the mighty one,' and gives us no real clue. In the puzzling verse x.101.12 we find Indra styled "Son of Nishtigrî;" but the word *nishtigrî* is met with nowhere else, and no data are at hand to explain it. *Sâyana*, of course, explains it; he makes it equivalent to Aditi.

III. The subject of Indra's functions in the universe is extremely copious, and embraces several questions of equal importance and difficulty. In the various manifestations of his power we find a ground on which he stands in common with other divinities. The most prominent of these manifestations is the battle which he has to fight in the air against the demons who steal the rain and light and withhold them from mortals; the most gracious act of his goodness, the restoration of these blessings to suffering men. His activity in this field brings him into an especially close connection with Trita, concerning whom it is endeavored to prove that he is an older deity who originally performed the functions of the later Indra, and sank gradually into insignificance before the rising national hero; with the

* Roth's latest views, as expressed in the *Pet. Dict.*, differ widely from these. He there calls him the chief of the deities of the middle region, i. e. the air, between heaven and earth.

† Yet in his *Chips*, II., p. 91, Müller styles him the chief solar deity of India!

Ādityas, especially with Varuṇa, whose lieutenant in a certain field Indra seems to have been, until finally he succeeded his master on the throne of heaven (a question treated of at considerable length in the essay); with the Maruts, the gods of the storm, who support their leader Indra in the storm-battle; with Soma, originally the well-known intoxicating beverage supposed by the simple-minded worshippers to be enjoyed by the god with even greater gusto than they themselves experienced, but before long personified and elevated into a hero of boundless prowess, and associated with Indra in all his exploits; with Brhaspati or Brahmanaspati, the god of prayer; with Agni, the god of fire and lightning, and Vishnu, the sun-god; and with Tvashtar and the Rbhu's, the skillful armorers and artificers. From the notion of Indra's paramount importance in preserving the natural order of the world was developed by gradual stages the belief that he was its creator, in which character we find him celebrated in passages of great sublimity. His benevolence towards his worshippers, finally, is praised in grateful language, and gives occasion for associating with him Pūshan and the two Ācvin, the divinities of benevolence *par excellence* among the Indians.

IV. The extraordinary popularity which this robust deity (who in the warlike epic period becomes the supreme unchallenged ruler of the gods) enjoyed among the Indian Aryans was the cause of his being celebrated in the most extravagant language. His personal appearance, his weapons, horses, chariot, his enormous appetite and still more prodigious thirst, are all described with the minuteness and exaggeration characteristic then as now of eastern poetry.

12. On Reformed Buddhism in China and Japan, by Pres. Martin.

Buddhism has always exhibited a remarkable facility of adaptation to the characters and circumstances of the people among whom it has been propagated. Hence the great difference in the aspects of the same religion in Tibet and Tartary, China and Japan, Ceylon and Burma. It might therefore be expected that Buddhism would undergo considerable modifications whenever it was brought into contact with Christianity. This is notably the case in Japan; and the modifications referred to have perhaps shown themselves earlier in that country on account of the lively susceptible character of the people. In illustration of this, the speaker proceeded to give an account of a visit which he had made in company with Mr. Nishima, a native Christian pastor, to a Buddhist College in Kioto, the ancient capital.

The buildings suggest reform by their external appearance, being in the best style of European architecture, and in strong contrast with the famous *Hungkon* temple, to which they are attached. They were erected, it is said, at a cost of 360,000 yen, or \$300,000. The organization is not yet complete, but provision is made for the various departments of instruction usually found in western universities. In the department of Natural Philosophy, the speaker was shown a large collection of apparatus (mostly imported) for the purpose of teaching experimental physics; and in the department of theology he saw a class of forty candidates for the priesthood taking notes of a lecture that was being delivered by a venerable looking Bonze.

The name of the sect to which this establishment belongs is *Shinsiu*, or the 'new doctrine'; and a tract which the speaker received from one of the professors indicates how justly it may claim that designation; explaining that the adherents of the Shinsiu have abandoned the practice of compulsory celibacy, renounced ascetic rites, and rejected the worship of all Buddhas or other deities, except Amida, the Unlimited or Eternal. This document further states that the soul is in a state of salvation the moment it exercises faith in the love of Amida: all of which are Christian doctrines under pagan names.

In China such reformed sects are numerous; but they have not in any case approached so near to the adoption of Christian dogmas, and are distinguished from the current Buddhism of that empire chiefly by an attitude of protest against certain forms of popular idolatry.

13. The Sutra in Forty-two Chapters, translated from the Tibetan by Mr. W. W. Rockhill, of Baltimore, Md.; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Rockhill points out in his introductory notice that this brief Sutra, one of the canonical works of Buddhism, has been already twice translated from the Tibetan—by A. Schiefner (1851) and L. Feer (1878); and also once from the Chinese, by Mr. S. Beal (J. R. A. S., vol. xix., 1862). He has been led to make a translation into English from the Tibetan version also by the fact that it contains in a concise form the most important points of Buddhist dogma and morals. The text used by him is the lithographed one published in 1868 by M. Feer from a copy in four languages (Chinese, Tibetan, Mongol, and Manchu) brought to France by the Abbé Huc.

The introduction (placed in the original text at the end of the work), giving the usual history of the importation of Buddhism into China, is as follows:

"In the 24th year of Tiu Tou Wang (the emperor Chao of the Chow) the year of the wood-tiger (1029 B. C.), the 4th month, the 8th day, a body of light coming from the southwest appeared in the king's palace. The king and his ministers, having seen it, questioned the wise men, who answered by the following prophecy: 'It is a sign that a mighty Lord will appear in that quarter (of the world), and that after a thousand years his doctrine will reach this land.'

"After that, in the 53d year of Muh Wang (949 B. C.), in the year of the water-ape, the second month, the 15th day, the Master (Sakyamuni) showed the way to enter into the Nirvana.

"After 1013 years (from the luminous apparition), in the reign *Yung-ping*, (65 A. D.), the eighth of Hān Ming-thi, in the first month, in the night of the 15th day, the king had a dream. A being of more than eight cubits in height, of the color of gold, (whose body) emitted light like the sun, descended into the palace. 'My doctrine,' he said, 'will spread itself gradually over this country.' The following day, (the king) having questioned his ministers (about this dream), the minister Hphu yi (Fu yi) answered him thus: 'Long ago, in the time of Tiu Tou Wang, there was a prophecy made in answer (to a question); this dream of the king's agrees with it.'

"Then the king looked over the old records, and was made happy by finding this prophecy of the time of Tiu Tou Wang. The king sent eighteen men, among whom was the minister Wang Tsun, into the west, to try to discover the teaching of the Buddha.

"They arrived at the kingdom of Yuo-chi, where two men of India of the family of Kacyapa, the Arhat Matangipa and the Pandit Gobharana (helped them) to put on a white horse the fundamental works, the Sutra in 42 chapters and other Sutras, both of the Great and the Little Vehicle, and also a vase full of relics of the Master. (After that) they started back by the road by which they had come. At the end of the 12th month they arrived at the fortress of Lo-yang.

"In six years from that time, the Arhat and the Pandit had converted the unbelievers of the Black Plain (i. e. China).

"After that, the Arhat and the Pandit rising into the air spoke these verses to the king:

'The foxes' whelps are not of the lion's race;
A burning lamp is not like the sun and moon;
A little pond is not like the whole ocean;
Every mountain has not the majesty of Meru;
The cloud of the Law covers the whole world;
The rain of the Law moisteneth the seeds (in the hearts) of all mankind;
By showing wonders and miracles
(The Law) teaches mankind in all quarters of the world.'

"Having spoken thus, they returned to India by means of their magical powers.

"This is the origin and history of this Sutra. Originally it did not exist in Tibetan; but having been put in the Chinese Bkahlgyur (pron. Kanjur), it was translated into the Manchu language by order of the High one guarded by heaven (Kienlung), and translated also into the language of Bod (i. e. Tibet) by Dkah-bchu Subhagaçreyadhwa and Dkah-bchu Dhyanaśishtaṃvyasa. It was translated into the language of Sog (i. e. Mongolian) by the learned professor Prajnodayavyasa. The patron of the doctrine of the Victorious (i. e. Jina, the

Buddha), Hīṅg līn, wishing to make known the Law, gave one hundred ounces of silver to have it engraved and printed in the four languages.

"May the seeds of virtue given to those who have become exceeding holy help the doctrine of the Victorious to be widely diffused for many years to come; may there not be in (all) the quarters of the earth either sickness, or famine, or tumult, or quarrelling. May all living beings speedily arrive at that wisdom which has no superior."

14. On the Transliteration of Sanskrit, by Prof. Whitney.

In this paper, the subject was presented substantially as below.

The question of the transliteration of Sanskrit is not merely a part of the vast and difficult one of representing alphabetic sounds in general by Roman letters; it has a quite specific and practical aspect: namely, how are the native Indian characters best to be turned into European ones, in view of the very great use made of the latter by Sanskrit scholars and by philologists generally. Not only are Sanskrit words and forms constantly needing to be quoted in philological works, where the intricacy of the *devanāgarī* alphabet, and the difficulty of setting it along with our ordinary types, make transliteration necessary; whole volumes, and of every class, are published in the transliterated form, even such texts as the Rig-Veda (Aufrecht), the Tāittiriya-Samhitā (Weber), the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (Aufrecht), etc. There is nothing illegitimate about this: the language is written in India, to no small extent, in whatever alphabet the writers are accustomed to employ for other purposes; and there is no reason why we may not allow ourselves to do the same.

The systems of transliteration employed are in detail very various, almost every leading scholar and periodical having a peculiar one, more or less different from every other. Respecting only a small minority of letters is there entire agreement: these are *a, i, u, k, g, ṭ, d, p, b, n, m, r, l, s*; although also *t, dh, h* are used nearly universally. It is true that this variety causes little practical difficulty, since he who employs one system is but slightly embarrassed to understand any of the rest; and hence scholars need not be strongly urged to abandon methods long employed by them and take up new ones; yet it is evidently desirable that usage should at any rate be made to tend gradually toward unity. The points of discordance are of every kind and degree: in some cases, choice is a matter of indifference, and must be arbitrarily made, merely for the sake of unity; but there are also signs current whose use is decidedly to be reprobated, and, if possible, put down.

In reference to the vowels, in the first place, the leading question is, how long quantity shall be marked. The usual English (and hence also Indian) method has long been to write an acute accent over the long vowel: thus, *ā*. This is wholly to be disapproved; both because there is no adaptedness in such a mark to such a purpose, and because it thus becomes impossible to accentuate a vowel at all. Continental usage is divided between the *macron* and the circumflex accent: thus, *ā* or *â*. The choice between these two is comparatively indifferent; yet the former (*ā*) must be allowed to be on the whole preferable, for the reasons that the *macron* was devised for this particular purpose and has no other, and that it is more easily combined with the accent-marks (a consideration of prime importance): there is, in fact, a degree of incongruity in writing two accent-marks, a circumflex and an acute or grave, over the same letter. Grassmann's device, of using the *macron* for simple long and the circumflex for long acute, is ingenious, and obviates a certain difficulty as regards type; but it is hardly worthy of general adoption, since it involves an inconsistency, and also leaves the case of a long circumflex (*svarita*) unprovided for. For these reasons, after employing the circumflex-sign for thirty years, I have myself recently adopted the *macron* instead.

The question of representation of the *r*-vowel is of quite another kind. Two signs divide between them general usage: namely, *ṛ* and *ṛi* (and to the former of these Lepsius's sign, with little circle instead of dot beneath the *r*, may be regarded as practically equivalent, being theoretically preferable). Here the choice is not a matter of indifference, but involves an obviously important principle: not to give unnecessarily to a single element a double sign involving a false utterance. All

who understand Sanskrit phonetics know that the sound represented is a pure *r*-sound, and that *ri* is a later Hindu mispronunciation; there is no reason, theoretical or practical, why we should adopt and perpetuate the error. Simple *r*, with marks of quantity and of accent to be added as in the case of the other short vowel signs, is the only acceptable representative. It follows, of course, that *l*, and not *li*, and *ā* *fortiori* not that monstrous absurdity *lri*, should be written for the *l*-vowel.

The representation of the diphthongs has its minor difficulties. For the *guṇa*-diphthongs, there is almost universal acceptance of the signs *e*, *o*, with the corresponding pronunciation; and this pronunciation has been so long the custom in India, and hence also without exception in Europe, that no scruple need be felt as to admitting the *e*- and *o*-signs. Yet the value of those diphthongs was so evidently *ai*, *au* at the beginning, and even in earliest Sanskrit, that we cannot help wishing it were possible to introduce the corresponding written forms—as indeed has been done, though without further imitation, by one or two French scholars, the usages of their own language favoring the substitution. The heavier diphthongs are written either *ai*, *au* or *āi*, *āu*: the latter are more etymologically correct, but the former are easier, and sufficiently well suited to *e*, *o*; there is not much to choose between them. To make evident the diphthongal quantity, *ē* and *ō* are written by some: it is well enough, yet seems a needless trouble; Grassmann's *ē*, *ō* for the heavier diphthongs has found no imitation, and is not to be commended.

The designation of the acute (*udātta*) accent by our ordinary acute mark is universal; and nearly or quite so is likewise that of the circumflex (*svarita*) by our so-called grave accent (thus, *yā*). No more suitable sign than the latter could be devised, since the tone signified by it is in fact a downward slide forward.

Passing now to the consonants, the first question concerns the mode of writing the aspirate mutes. And here, the addition of an *h* to the non-aspirate is well-nigh universal; Bopp's added reversed apostrophe—as *t'* etc.—is hardly any longer in use. In this there is nothing to be regretted; the element by which the aspirate differs from the non-aspirate may be sufficiently well signified by *h*, nor does the distinction of surd and sonant in regard to it need to be insisted on. As to the mute-classes, the marking of the linguals (or by whatever other name we may call the *murdhanya*-class) with a dot beneath—thus, *t*, *d*—is also nearly without exception, and unobjectionable. But the treatment of the palatals is a harder question, and embarrassed moreover by the doubt concerning the precise phonetic value of the sounds at a given period. To me, *c* and *j* (with, of course, *ch* and *jh* as aspirates) seem on the whole to be preferred: accented gutturals (as *k'*, *g'*) are more burdensome, and also interfere with the clearness of the actual accent; nor should, on theoretical grounds, any diacritical mark be employed with so diverse values. This last reason is conclusive also against the common English use of *ch* and *chh*—in which, moreover, is involved a needless waste of time and labor.

Of the nasals, *n* and *m* pass without question; and *ṇ*, for the lingual, goes by constraint of analogy with *t*, *d*; as regards the two others, considerations of convenience must determine. One of them will naturally be written *ṇ̄*, because that sign is widely found already provided in fonts of type; and, in accordance with its general value, this is best assigned to the palatal nasal. For the remaining guttural is oftenest met with an *n* with short horizontal line above it—which line ought, by its length or otherwise, to be well distinguished from the *macron*.

In connection with the nasals may be considered the representation of the *anusvāra*, difficult both on account of the variety of methods employed, and because, with the Hindu phonetists as well as with their modern successors, there has been question as to the phonetic value of the sound: whether and how far it was a nasalization of the vowel, or a nasal element following the vowel. Since, however, the Hindu texts in general use the same sign for all the different classes of cases, and whatever their theoretic estimate of the sound, there appears to be no good reason why we should not do the same thing with the same unanimity: writing, for example, *haṇsa*, and allowing its *ṇ* to be viewed as having either the one character or the other. For it would be as good as impossible to provide a

complete set of vowel-signs, unaccented and accented, with a mark of nasality added. Whether *n* or *m* shall be used as basis, and what and where the diacritical mark applied, must be mainly a matter of arbitrary selection: I prefer a dot above rather than below, because the dot below is already in full use as lingual mark, and because the dot above seems like a reproduction of the corresponding *devanāgarī* sign; and further, the adoption of the latter allows us to write *ñ* for a more independent *anusvāra*, and *m̐* for an *m* assimilated to a following consonant—a distinction which has a high practical convenience.

Of the semivowels, only the palatal and labial call for discussion. For the latter of these, too, *v* is so generally current as representative that it may almost pass for universal; a few Germans use *w* instead, but for no good and defensible reason. Historically best, to be sure, would be a *w* in the English sense and having the English utterance. Yet the English sound is also originally represented by *v*; and as we write both Latin *vinum* and French *vin*, recognizing the *w*-sound as belonging to the earlier word and the *v*-sound to the later, we may properly enough do the same in the Sanskrit. For the palatal semivowel are widely used both *y* and *j*. The latter has much in its favor, being in all respects related to *i* as *v* to *u*; and it is to the Germans the natural sign for the sound, as is *y* to the English and French. The choice of designation has to be made in connection with that for the sonant palatal mute; and there is, it may fairly be claimed, a gain of convenience and economy in adopting for the two sounds *j* and *y*, rather than in taking *g'* and *j*, and so leaving *y* out of use altogether.

Among the sibilants we have only one fixed point, the dental *s*; in regard to the other two usage is very fluctuating, and the prevailing practice not altogether to be approved. It was apparently by some mishap that at the outset *sh* came to be used by the English for the lingual instead of the palatal sibilant, the two being regarded as practically undistinguished in utterance (for the definition of the lingual as like *sh* in *shun*, and the palatal as like *ss* in *session*, though servilely copied from one grammar to another down to the latest, really means this, since the sounds in the two words are precisely the same); the impression was thus given that the lingual was the normal *sh*-sound, and the error has been perpetuated in a great variety of ways. There is one wholly unobjectionable mode of correcting it: namely, by letting the lingual point below the letter do for the sibilant what it does for the mutes and nasal, and so writing *s*. This Grassmann (as perhaps some before him) has done, and others are doing—myself, for example, after reluctantly writing *sh* for a generation. The sign *sh*, or anything else involving the same implication, should be banished from general use. For the palatal sibilant, the customary English sign *s'* is very bad, as again using an accent-mark to signify what is not accent, and embarrassing the designation of the real accent. On the continent is most widely employed the sign *ç*, which answers the purpose quite sufficiently well, although nothing very positive is to be said in its favor save that it includes a palatal letter as basis, and is found provided and ready for use in many fonts. In an alphabet of wider bearing, whatever sign stands for the *sh*-sound would be the most suitable representative of this sibilant.*

Bopp's addition of a diacritical point to our *h* as sign of the Sanskrit aspiration has, so far as observed, found no imitators, and is not to be commended. The character *h* for *visarga* is too firmly rooted in general usage to be displaced; nor is there pressing need for seeking a better representative for the sound.

To sum up briefly: the items to be most strongly urged, as involving important principles, are the use of *ṛ* and *ṣ* for the lingual vowel and the lingual sibilant respectively; of next consequence, for the sake of uniformity, is the adoption of the signs *c*, *j*, *y*, *ç* for the palatal sounds; the designations of long vowels, of the diphthongs, of the nasals, are minor matters, which will doubtless settle themselves by degrees in the right manner.

A remark or two may be added as to the division of words. As every one knows, there is in the manuscripts no division at all; the whole text is written solid, and prose and verse alike. The European rule is, to make in *devanāgarī* writing or printing a separation between words, whenever it can be done without

* A recent isolated case of the introduction of *ś* as sign of the palatal sibilant is against every analogy, and altogether to be condemned.

any alteration of the written form; and it is so reasonable, and so universally practiced, that no suggestion of a change appears called for. In transliterated text, now, the natural adaptation of this rule would evidently be, to separate wherever the transliterated form suffers no alteration: thus, for example, *tāt savitūr vārenyam*. To write *tātsavitūrvārenyam* because in *devanāgarī* the words would have to be so connected is certainly the height of impractical bad logic—not to say of pedantry. The Boppian method of dividing also words whose final and initial vowels are fused into one sound, putting a single or double apostrophe before the second word, will naturally be followed only where the convenience of earliest beginners has to be consulted; but too anxiously to avoid it there seems to me to savor of the pedantic. Certainly, its application in transliterated texts (e. g. *tathāi 'vā 'sīt*) is not only unobjectionable, but to be recommended; and it is even as good as imperative where the authoritative form of a word (as determined, for example, by a *pada*-text or by a commentary) is to be briefly signified.

15. Notes on certain analogous Structures and Constructions in Tibetan and Japanese, by Mr. Rockhill; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Rockhill briefly reviews the analogies between the two languages in question with regard to the verb, the noun-forms in construction, the formation of abstracts and diminutives, the uses of adjectives and numerals, of pronouns and adverbs, the value of reduplications, and so on.

One or two other communications were for lack of time withdrawn, to be presented at the next meeting.

A vote of thanks to the authorities of Columbia College, for the hospitable reception and entertainment offered by them, was passed, and the Society adjourned, to meet again in Boston on Wednesday, May 25th, 1881.